



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.

1899.

I. — *The Text of the Andria of Terence.*

BY PROF. H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH,

LELAND STANFORD JR. UNIVERSITY.

To the editor of the *Andria* the question of the relative value of the Calliopian Mss. is of prime importance. For this play, as is well known, the Bembine (A) is available for less than one hundred lines (viz. 888 to the end). A text must therefore be built upon the less important Mss. These fall into groups, one (δ) represented best by the Victorianus (D) and Decurtatus (G), another (γ) by the Parisinus (P), the Vaticanus (C), a less faithful copy of the same original as (P), and the Basilicanus (B), the last a mere reproduction of the Vaticanus. Of the other Mss. the Fragmentum Vindobonense (V), which belongs to the δ family, contains only seventy lines of the *Andria*, the Ambrosianus (F) lacks all of it, while the Lipsiensis (L) and the Riccardianus (E) have each lost nearly two hundred lines of this play. For the *Andria*, then, D and P, supported respectively by the inferior G and C, are the most important Terentian Mss.

D and P are believed to be of about the same age, ninth or tenth century A.D.,¹ but there is considerable difference in their general features. P, for instance, has preserved the metres,

¹ Hauler regards P as slightly older than D.

which D, except in some of the prologues, has lost. P too retains very old illustrations, while on the other hand D follows an old custom in distinguishing the *personae* by means of Greek letters. D too, with its allied Mss., including Monacensis 14420 (M) (v. Schlee, *Scholia Terentiana*), preserves a definite kind of scholia, which are altogether wanting in P, though single ones by a later hand are found in C.

It is hardly necessary to review here the various theories of Umpfenbach, Dziatzko, Leo, Prinzhorn, and Schlee, who seek to determine what is meant by the Callipian recension and what is the precise relation of the two main groups of Mss. to each other, and to a common original. My purpose in this paper is to examine, from a practical standpoint, not the question of their descent, but rather of their comparative and intrinsic worth.

Scholars have generally assumed that the δ group, besides belonging to an older stock, also possesses a decided superiority over the γ family. Indeed, Spengel is the only editor of Terence who consistently gives the preference to P. The traditional and generally accepted view was ably combated by Professor Pease in a paper "On the Relative Value of the Mss. of Terence" published in the *TRANSACTIONS* for 1887, Vol. XVIII. Basing his arguments on the *apparatus criticus* furnished by Umpfenbach, Professor Pease proved, by carefully comparing the Mss. and counting the variants, that the importance of the γ family had been seriously underrated, that A more often agrees with it than with the δ family, and that far fewer errors had crept into the archetype of the former than into that of the latter.

The only criticisms of Pease's paper which I have discovered are offered by Dziatzko and Hauler. The former in the *Rheinisches Museum*, XLVI. (1891), p. 47, while claiming that the material collected by Pease agrees best with his (Dziatzko's) own view as to the relation of the Mss., remarks that work of this kind cannot be free from the subjective element. Hauler (v. note 1, p. 189 of his revision of Dziatzko's *Phormio*, Leipzig, 1898), disposes of the whole question with the assertion that Professor Pease's facts and

figures rest upon the very untrustworthy apparatus and text of Umpfenbach.

That Umpfenbach's *apparatus criticus* is not wholly satisfactory has been shown by Warren, Hauler, and Schlee. Up to the present, however, it is the only one available, and though another is in preparation, we must assume that since Umpfenbach the editors of Terence have been dependent mainly upon Umpfenbach's apparatus.

Such a task as Umpfenbach set himself was a stupendous one and was necessarily subdivided among various workers, some of whom may have failed to do their work as thoroughly as others. The Parisinus was collated by August Fritsch, just before the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, but the mistakes which Warren has found in Fritsch's collation can not, as I infer from Warren's article "On Bentley's English Mss. of Terence" (*American Journal of Philology*, Vol. III. p. 59), materially affect Mr. Pease's conclusions, if indeed they do not lend them additional support.

At any rate, until a new and thorough collation of the leading Terentian Mss. is published, an editor of Terence must base his work upon Umpfenbach's *apparatus*, availing himself, of course, of such additional light as various scholars often throw upon the subject.

The objection that Pease's reasoning cannot be free from the subjective element is perfectly valid, if he followed his own preference in choosing between conflicting readings. But let us examine some of the best modern editions, which theoretically assign more weight to the δ than to the γ family. I say 'theoretically,' for my own investigations seem to prove that certain Mss. are not as authoritative with some scholars as they themselves imagine.

Confining myself to D and P as the best representatives of the two groups, I have recorded the instances in the *Andria* where these Mss. conflict, and then, under certain recognized heads, such as inverted order, insertions (or additions), omissions, verb- or substantive-changes, substitutions (of a more general kind), and orthography, I have noted the number of times either Ms. is rejected or accepted by the best modern

editors; viz. Dziatzko, Fleckeisen, and Spengel. In many cases, to be sure, neither D nor P is accepted by an editor, but a *via media* is found or some conjectural reading is adopted. Such instances will not be included, but they will explain why the total number of cases is not the same for all editors. Throughout this paper I avail myself of Warren's corrections of Umpfenbach's *apparatus*, both those published in the *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. III. p. 59 ff., and others very kindly furnished me by that scholar in a private letter.

I find then that where D and P conflict, Dziatzko (1884) accepts D **129** times (order 21, insertions 6, omissions 37, substitutions 21, verb-changes in mood, tense, number, or person 4, substantive-changes in number, case, or gender 3, spellings 35, scene-division 1, change of rôle 1), but accepts P **348** times (order 61, insertions 73, omissions 37, substitutions 63, verb-changes 20, substantive-changes 4, spellings 90).

Again, Fleckeisen (2d edition, 1898), even more partial to D than Dziatzko, accepts D **139** times (order 27, insertions 3, omissions 40, substitutions 27, verb-changes 5, subst.-changes 3, spellings 31, scene-division 1, change of rôle 2), but accepts P **351** times (order 50, insertions 72, omissions 45, substitutions 55, verb-changes 19, subst.-changes 4, spellings 105, change of rôle 1).

In contrast with these D editors let us examine Spengel (2d edition of *Andria*, 1888), who shows a most decided preference for P. Spengel then accepts P (and rejects D) **379** times (order 67, insertions 75, omissions 36, substitutions 74, verb-changes 17, subst.-changes 2, spellings 106, scene-divisions 2), but rejects P (and accepts D) only **108** times (order 21, insertions 10, omissions 25, substitutions 12, verb-changes 5, subst.-changes 2, spellings 31, scene-division 1, change of rôle 1).

Before drawing the obvious conclusions from the preceding figures, let us consider what is perhaps a serious objection to our argument. In describing the *Victorianus*, Umpfenbach (p. xviii of his edition) says of it, "duo folia, quartum et quintum, reliquis paululo recentiora sunt." But Schlee in *Wiener Stu-*

dien, Vol. 46 (1891), pp. 147-150, has pointed out that this statement (the folia in question belong, he claims, to the eleventh century) is also applicable to folia 12 and 13, 25 and 26, and two single ones, 108 and 134. The portions of the *Andria* included in these folia are I. 1, 71-I. 2, 8 (vv. 98-179); II. 3, 10-II. 6, 22 (vv. 384-453); and V. 2, 5-V. 3, 32 (vv. 846-903), embracing 207 verses. According to Schlee, a study of the glosses and orthography of these later folia leads to the conclusion that they are to be classed with the γ family. This conclusion is unwarranted. The figures I am giving show that P is far superior to D in the matter of orthography. The very examples cited by Schlee are sufficient to disprove his statement. He notes the fact that we find *Chremes* and *Chrisis* in the old folia of D, but in the later, without exception, *Cremes* and *Crisis*. But this spelling without the aspirate is not characteristic of γ . On the contrary, nowhere in the *Andria*, *Heauton*, or *Phormio* does P show the unaspirated form, and C has it only twice (*Heaut. personae* V. 2 and *Phorm.* 1026). And yet outside of the passages covered by the later folia (including *Phorm.* IV. 1, 22-IV. 3, 28 and *Heaut.* III. 1, 57-III. 2, 6) D itself exhibits *Cremes* and *Crisis* in *Andr.* 361, 796 and *personae* of IV. 4, as well as in *personae* of *Heaut.* I. 1, and *Phorm.* IV. 5, while G has these forms in *Andr. per.* 5, 106 (G¹), 247, 773, 801, 803, 823; *Phorm.* 567; *Heaut. personae* III. 1, III. 3, IV. 5, and vv. 585, 938. Even E and F exhibit these forms less frequently than G. Schlee himself calls attention to certain other resemblances between these later folia and G, and when to the above facts we add that *Carinus* (unaspirated) is the spelling of G in *Andr. per.* 12, v. 642, and *personae* of IV. 1, with *Heaut.* 732, we see that, so far as orthography goes, instead of allying these folia with P, we have good reason for classing them with G (δ family).

However, as it is in these folia, according to Schlee (and the statement is probably correct), that we meet most frequently the alterations, transpositions, omissions, and additions, "none of which before the judgment seat of editors have found grace," it may be well, in testing the comparative worth of P and D for the *Andria* to omit altogether from our calculations the

passages covered by these later folia. This I have done, and my amended figures are as follows :

Dziatzko accepts D 105 times, but accepts P 219 times.

Fleckeisen accepts D 113 times, but accepts P 218 times.

Spengel accepts D 88 times, but accepts P 237 times.

If faultiness in orthography be disregarded, as being less important than the other categories, P will still be found on the whole much superior to D, for only in regard to omissions can D make as favorable a showing as P.¹

I have already referred to the fact that for the *Andria* the Bembine (A) is illegible until we reach v. 888. Altogether there are about 85 lines (vv. 903-912 are lost) in which we can compare A's readings with those of D and P. However, in these we find that where D and P are at variance, A agrees with P 35 times, and with D only 19 times. These totals will be reduced respectively to 28 and 17, if we deduct the lines covered by folia 25 and 26 in D.

In thus taking the evidence furnished by editors like Dziatzko and Fleckeisen, who were certainly not influenced by an undue preference for P over D, and who, nevertheless, were compelled, by the exigencies of the case, to accept P's readings more frequently than D's, I have surely eliminated the 'subjective element,' and have also produced substantial proof of the greater authority of P.

In those lines where a reading must be rejected, as failing to satisfy the demands of metre, sense, or syntax, one has no need to plead for another reading, which does meet all requirements; but there are not a few instances in the *Andria* where, though the Mss. conflict, neither reading is intrinsically objectionable. In these cases, in view of its general superiority over the Victorianus, I believe I am justified in accepting the evidence of the Parisinus. Let me give some examples.

¹ Professor Warren writes to me, "In orthography especially he [Umpfenbach] is untrustworthy, so that I think Pease's conclusions on that point, or at least his statistics, are not reliable."

- v. 50 te in hac ré DG.
 in hac re té *rell.*
 In D (so Fleckeisen) *te* is deprived of its necessary emphasis.
- v. 205 dicas DG *cum Don. Eogr.*
 dices D² *cum rell.* Accepted by all editors except Dziatzko.
- v. 237 pro deum atque hominum fidem DC².
 pro deum fidem PC¹. P accepted by all editors except Fleckeisen, who drops the whole expression.
- v. 287 utraeque res inutiles DGE.
 utraeque inutiles PC. So all editors since Bentley. *res* is due to a gloss.
- v. 317 abi D (i *in ras.*) GE.
 abin PC¹. *n* erased by C² (Warren). P followed by editors.
 Th. Birt (*Rhein. Mus.* vol. 54, 1899, p. 216) supports *abi*.
- v. 343 aut quo DE.
 aut *om. rell.* "Sex ex nostris meliores non agnoscunt illud *aut*" (Bentley). Omitted by Bentley and Umpfenbach, retained by most editors.
- v. 353 ait tibi uxorem dare sese hodie D *cum* BE.
 sese *om. rell.* So most editors. Fleckeisen inserts *se* before *uxorem*.
- v. 477 narras D and Bentley's R.
 narres *rell.* Thus all editors.
- v. 495 se ipsus D and Bentley's R. So Umpfenbach, Dziatzko, Spengel, Fleckeisen.
 ipsus se PCE. *ipsus* regularly precedes the reflexive and so Luchs (Studemund's *Studien*, p. 47) and Meissner.
- v. 532 eccum ipsum obviam Chremem DG. So Wagner, rejecting the previous *ipso*.
 Chremem *om.* PCE. So Umpfenbach, Meissner, Spengel, Fleckeisen. Bentley kept *Chremem*, rejecting *obviam*. So Dziatzko. But see note in Spengel's *Anhang*. Von Winterfeld (*Schedae Criticae*, Berlin, 1895) retains *Chremem* and makes an octonarius by introducing *video* after *eccum*. (According to Warren, in private letter, P shows tempore || || *eccum*.)
- v. 633 p̄mit cogit
 cogit D, p̄mit G (Warren).
 premit *rell.* So Spengel and Fleckeisen. Most editors reject the line.

- v. 672 hoc convorti malum DG.
convorti hoc malum P *cum rell.* So all editors, except Fleckeisen.
- v. 706 me nunc D. So most editors.
nunc me PCE. So Spengel and Fleckeisen.
- v. 712 ad me ut venias DG. So Umpfenbach, Meissner, Dziatzko, Fleckeisen.
ut *om.* PC, "duo ex nostris vetustissimi" (Bentley). So Bentley, Spengel.
- v. 717 putabam DG (Warren). So Fleckeisen alone of recent editors, transposing with *hunc*.
putavi *rell.*
- v. 720 dolorem DG. So Schol. C (Warren) and Bentley's R. Accepted by Fleckeisen.
laborem *rell. cum Eugr.* So most editors. We have *labor* 'trouble' in 831, 870.
- v. 762 tibi dico ego an non? DG. So Bentley, Umpfenbach, Fleckeisen.
tibi égo dico an non? PC. So Wagner, Meissner, Dziatzko, Spengel.
- v. 816 non libet D¹GP². So most editors.
non licet P¹CD²E *cum Don. Eugr.* So Spengel. Certainly the preferable reading. Crito's generous nature would not *allow* him to rob Glycerium.
- v. 836 facta D. So Bentley (with three Mss.), Meissner, Dziatzko.
ficta PCGD²M (Schlee) E (Warren). So Klotz, Wagner, Spengel, Fleckeisen.
The fact that *facio* and *incipio* are often combined, as in 236, Eun. 966, would probably lead to the corruption.
- v. 915 hic sit vir DGV. So Fleckeisen.
hic vir sit A *cum rell.* So most editors.
- v. 971 quin iam PC, "duo ex nostris veterrimi" (Bentley).
quin eam A *cum rell.* Here with Bentley, Wagner, Meissner, Spengel, it is best to read *iam*, which accords with a lover's eagerness. Cf. Adolph. 700.
Quid? iam uxorem? Iam. Iam? Iam quantum potest.

In conclusion, I beg to propose a simple emendation for a troublesome passage in the *Andria*.

In v. 728 Bentley's *iurato* is accepted by almost all editors

for the impossible *iusiurandum* of the Mss. Donatus read *iurandum*, which, however, he fails to explain satisfactorily. Why not *iurandumst*?

Quia, si forte opus sit, ad erum iurandumst mihi
Non adposisse, ut liquido possim.

“Because, if need be, I must swear that I did not place it here — and this I wish to do with a clear conscience.” The ellipsis is due to the colloquial style, and it is certainly far easier thus than to combine in clumsy fashion *quia ut*.